



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,140	08/17/2001	Brian Eric Bakke	IBM / 178	5139

7590 05/05/2006

Scott A. Stinebruner  
Wood, Herron & Evans, L.L.P.  
2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917

EXAMINER
----------

MANOSKEY, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/932,140

Applicant(s)

BAKKE ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Manoskey

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 12-21, and 25-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duso et al., U.S. Patent 5,987,621, hereinafter referred to as "Duso" in view of Erickson et al., U.S. Patent 6,408,343, hereinafter referred to as "Erickson".

3. Referring to claim 1, Duso teaches an apparatus with a plurality of physical stream server hardware, which is interpreted as access adapters that are configured to access an electronic resource for the hosts on the network (See Duso, Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 30-48). Duso also teaches one or more stream servers, being kept in standby mode to be used as "hot spares" for any one of the other stream servers, this is interpreted as being spare adapters that are "shareable", function as a network, and removably coupled (See Duso, Fig. 2, Col. 10, lines 23-28). Finally Duso teaches the apparatus in having two control servers, this is interpreted as control circuitry (See Duso, Fig. 2). The control server performs a stream server failover task (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 1-6).

Duso does not teach “without intervention by an server in electronic communication with the electronic resource”, however Duso teaches a plurality of stream servers, which perform the function of shareable adapters, and including standby servers, or spare adapters (See Duso, Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 30-48 and Col. 10, lines 23-28). Erickson teaches adapters that can failover from a master to a redundant adapter and that automatically self-configure, this is interpreted a “supplant a substituted access adapter without intervention by any server in electronic communication with the electronic resource (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 25-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatically self-configured failover adapters of Erickson with the shareable spare servers (shareable adapters) of Duso. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the adapters offer availability, fault-tolerance and robustness with a minimum of operator intervention (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 35-38).

4. Referring to claims 2, 3, and 5, Duso and Erickson teach all limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the control server monitoring a heartbeat signal, or “event”, from the stream servers to determine if a failover task should be performed (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 1-10).

5. Referring to claim 4, Duso and Erickson disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 2) including the control server having a client control failover mode where the

control server informs the client of the stream server failure, which is interpreted as a notification (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 17-19).

6. Referring to claim 6, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 2) including the apparatus having two control servers that where one is inactive and monitors a signal sent to it from the active control server. In the event the signal stops and the control server becomes inoperative a failover mechanism is used to start the inactive control server (See Duso, Col. 3, lines 30-60). This is interpreted as the control circuitry monitoring a process that monitors the event.

7. Referring to claim 7, Duso and Erickson disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the stream server, or access adapters having two ports and each port only accesses a subset of the shared resources (See Duso, Fig. 2).

8. Referring to claim 8, Duso and Erickson teach the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including that any of the steam servers can be placed in a standby mode and be used as a "hot spare" (See Duso, Col. 10, lines 23-28). This is interpreted as reconfiguring a second adapter as a sharable spare adapter.

9. Referring to claims 12 and 14, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the control server performing a failover task of a stream

server (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 1-10). This is interpreted as the control circuitry replacing an access adapter and disabling the failed access adapter.

10. Referring to claim 13, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including that any of the stream servers can be placed in a standby mode and be used as a "hot spare" (See Duso, Col. 10, lines 23-28). This is interpreted as disabling the spare adapter.

11. Referring to claims 15 and 16, Duso discloses a method for an apparatus with a plurality of physical stream server hardware, which is interpreted as access adapters, which are configured to access an electronic resource for the hosts on the network (See Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 38-40). Duso also teaches one or more stream servers, being kept in standby mode to be used as "hot spares" for any one of the other stream servers, this is interpreted as being spare adapters that are "shareable", function as a network, and removably coupled (See Fig. 2, Col. 10, lines 23-28). Also included is a control server that performs a stream server failover task for a failed stream server (See Col. 4, lines 1-6). The hot spares can replace any stream server, which is interpreted as replacing a first, second, and even a third stream server, or access adapter.

Duso does not teach "without intervention by an server in electronic communication with the electronic resource", however Duso teaches a plurality of stream servers, which perform the function of shareable adapters, and including standby servers, or spare adapters (See Duso, Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 30-48 and

Col. 10, lines 23-28). Erickson teaches adapters that can failover from a master to a redundant adapter and that automatically self-configure, this is interpreted a "supplant a substituted access adapter without intervention by any server in electronic communication with the electronic resource (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 25-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatically self-configured failover adapters of Erickson with the shareable spare servers (shareable adapters) of Duso. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the adapters offer availability, fault-tolerance and robustness with a minimum of operator intervention (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 35-38).

12. Referring to claims 17 and 18, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 15) including the control server monitoring a heartbeat signal, or "event", from the stream servers to determine if a failover task should be performed (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 1-10).

13. Referring to claim 19, Duso and Erickson disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 17) including the control server having a client control failover mode where the control server informs the client of the stream server failure, which is interpreted as a notification (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 17-19).

Art Unit: 2113

14. Referring to claim 20, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 17) including the method for the apparatus having two control servers that where one is inactive and monitors a signal sent to it from the active control server. In the event the signal stops and the control server becomes inoperative a failover mechanism is used to start the inactive control server (See Duso, Col. 3, lines 30-60). This is interpreted as the control circuitry monitoring a process that monitors the event.

15. Referring to claim 21, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 15) including that any of the steam servers can be placed in a standby mode and be used as a "hot spare" (See Duso, Col. 10, lines 23-28). This is interpreted as reconfiguring a second adapter as a sharable spare adapter.

16. Referring to claims 25 and 27, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 15) including the control server performing a failover task of a stream server (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 1-10). This is interpreted as the control circuitry replacing an access adapter and disabling the failed access adapter.

17. Referring to claim 26, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 15) including that any of the steam servers can be placed in a standby mode and be used as a "hot spare" (See Duso, Col. 10, lines 23-28). This is interpreted as disabling the spare adapter.



18. Referring to claim 28, Duso and Erickson disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 15) including the stream server, or access adapters having two ports and each port only accesses a subset of the shared resources (See Duso, Fig. 2).

19. Referring to claim 29, Duso discloses a program product for an apparatus with a plurality of physical stream server hardware, which is interpreted as access adapters, which are configured to access an electronic resource for hosts on the network (See Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 30-48). Duso also teaches one or more stream servers, being kept in standby mode to be used as "hot spares" for any one of the other stream servers, this is interpreted as being spare adapters that are "shareable", function as a network, and removably coupled (See Fig. 2, Col. 10, lines 23-28). Also included is a control server that performs a stream server failover task for a failed stream server (See Col. 4, lines 1-6). The hot spares can replace any stream server, which is interpreted as replacing a first, second, and even a third stream server, or access adapter. Duso discloses the controller server being programmed to perform the failover task of the stream servers, or access adapters, which is interpreted as a signal bearing recordable media bearing the program (See Col. 4, lines 1-6).

Duso does not teach "without intervention by an server in electronic communication with the electronic resource", however Duso teaches a plurality of stream servers, which perform the function of shareable adapters, and including standby servers, or spare adapters (See Duso, Fig. 1 and 2, and Col. 2, lines 30-48 and Col. 10, lines 23-28). Erickson teaches adapters that can failover from a master to a

redundant adapter and that automatically self-configure, this is interpreted a "supplant a substituted access adapter without intervention by any server in electronic communication with the electronic resource (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 25-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatically self-configured failover adapters of Erickson with the shareable spare servers (shareable adapters) of Duso. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the adapters offer availability, fault-tolerance and robustness with a minimum of operator intervention (See Erickson, Col. 4, lines 35-38).

20. Claims 9-11 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duso and Erickson in view of Conseil, U.S. Patent 5,964,887.

21. Referring to claims 9 and 22, Duso and Erickson teach all the limitations (See rejection of claims 1 and 15 respectively) except for removal of a correlation token from the access adapter, however Duso does teach re-routing the data stream from a failed stream server, access adapter, to a spare stream server in a transparent mode, this is interpreted as passing the identity of the of the failed server to the spare server (See Duso, Col. 4, lines 15-17). Conseil teaches a system where a failed active station is switched over to a back-up station (See Conseil, Col. 1, lines 15-18). Conseil discloses this being done with an identifier or "token" (See Conseil, Col. 1, lines 46-49). It would be obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

token passing of Conseil with the failover of stream servers (adapters) of Duso and Erickson. This would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because provides transparent manner of switch to a back-up (See Conseil, Col. 1, lines 26-30).

22. Referring to claims 10 and 23, Duso, Erickson, and Conseil teach all the limitations (See rejection of claims 9 and 22 respectively) including passing the token to the spare or back-up adapter. Conseil teaches using the token to pass the identity to the back-up, this is interpreted as passing the token to the spare adapter (See Conseil, Col. 1, lines 15-17 and 46-49).

23. Referring to claims 11 and 24, Duso, Erickson, and Conseil teach all the limitations (See rejection of claims 9 and 22 respectively) including the evaluation of the correlation token. Conseil discloses a station becoming operational if it is determined if the token is present, this is interpreted as evaluating the token (See Conseil, Col. 1, lines 65-67).

### ***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments, see pages 6 to 9 of amendment, filed 02 March 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8, 12-21, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and claim(s) 9-11 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

Art Unit: 2113

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of new found prior art, see above rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Manoskey whose telephone number is (571) 272-3648. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (7:30am to 4pm).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2113

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDM  
May 2, 2006

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100